DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 786 SP 010 842

AUTHOR Short, Edmund C., Ed.
TITLE [Proceedings of Curriculum and Objectives Session - Division B - American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April 21, 1976.]
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 54p.; Papers presented at meeting of American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 21, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Education; Curriculum Design; Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Evaluation; *Curriculum Research; *Educational Assessment; Educational History; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Status Comparison; Needs Assessment; *Professional Associations; Summative Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS American Educational Research Association

ABSTRACT

This document is a transcript of the meeting of Division B - Curriculum and Objectives, held in San Francisco in the spring of 1976. Included are short speeches on the subject of the history of the work of this division over the past twelve years; the principal address, "The Moribund Curriculum Field: Its Wake and Our Work"; and two responses to the address. (JD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED135786

Proceedings
of Session 15.18

Commemorative Assembly
and
Invited Address

Division B - Curriculum and Objectives
American Educational Research Association

April 21, 1976
Colonial Room, St. Francis Hotel
San Francisco

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Edited by

Edmund C. Short
The Pennsylvania State University
1976 Program Chairman, Division B

SP 010 842

WHERE HAVE WE BEEN
AND WHERE ARE WE GOING?
BICENTENNIAL YEAR REFLECTIONS
ON DIVISION B's 12th AND
AERA's 60th ANNIVERSARIES

Commemorative Assembly and Invited Address

PRESIDING	*Edmund C. Short, 1976 Division B Program Chairman, The Pennsylvania State University*
REMARKS	*Nathaniel Gage, AERA President, 1963-4, Stanford University* *Vernon Anderson, Committee on Original Purpose of Division B, 1963-4* *William F. Russell, AERA Executive Officer* *Decker F. Walker, Division B Vice-President, 1975-7, Stanford University* Recognition of Division B Leaders: Past and Present
ADDRESS	The Moribund Curriculum Field: Its Wake and Our Work *Dwayne Huebner, Teachers College, Columbia University*
RESPONDENTS	*Eric Straumanis, Denison University* *B. Othanel Smith, University of South Florida*
RECEIVING LINE	Platform Guests and Division B Leaders

Division B Officers

1976-1977

Vice-President – Decker Walker
Stanford University

Secretary – Janet H. Whitla
Educational Development Center

Division B

Curriculum and Objectives

American Educational Research Association

Commemorative Assembly

and

Invited Address

Colonial Room, St. Francis Hotel

San Francisco

April 21, 1976

	AERA President	Division B Vice-President	Division B Secretary	Division B Program Chairman	Division B Invited Address
1963-4 (Chicago)	N. L. Gage	(Organization Meeting – John R. Mayor, Vernon Anderson, Robert Gagné)			
1964-5 (Chicago)	Lee J. Cronbach	John I. Goodlad	B. O. Smith		
1965-6 (Chicago)	Benjamin S. Bloom	J. Thomas Hastings	B. O. Smith		
1966-7 (New York)	Julian Stanley	J. Thomas Hastings	C. M. Lindvall	Robert L. Baker	
1967-8 (Chicago)	John I. Goodlad	B. O. Smith	C. M. Lindvall	Arno A. Bellack	Benjamin S. Bloom, *Mastery Learning for All*
1968-9 (Los Angeles)	David R. Krathwohl	B. O. Smith	Arno A. Bellack	Kenneth J. Rehage	Joseph J. Schwab, *The Practical: A Language for Curriculum*
1969-70 (Minneapolis)	Roald F. Campbell	Arno A. Bellack	George Beauchamp	Henry J. Hermanowicz	Harry Broudy, *Components and Constraints of Curriculum Theory*
1970-1 (New York)	Robert M. Gagné	Arno A. Bellack	George Beauchamp	Louise L. Tyler	Kenneth Boulding, *The Educational Industry as a Pathological Segment of the Economy*
1971-2 (Chicago)	Robert Glaser	O. L. Davis	George Beauchamp	James B. Macdonald	Gibson Winter, *Education for a Reflective Society*
1972-3 (New Orleans)	Robert Ebel	O. L. Davis	David Turney	David Turney Walter Gullins	Urban Dahllof, *Data on Curriculum and Teaching Process*
1973-4 (Chicago)	Patrick Suppes	Robert Stake	David Turney	Marcella Kysilka	Arthur W. Foshay, *Curriculum Design for a Humane School*
1974-5 (Washington)	Robert L. Thorndike	Robert Stake	John M. Kean	Ulf Lundgren Tom Grayson	Elliot W. Eisner, *Toward a Reformation of Curriculum Evaluation*
1975-6 (San Francisco)	Gene V Glass	Decker Walker	John M. Kean	Edmund C. Short	Dwayne Huebner, *The Moribund Curriculum Field: Its Wake and Our Work*

Edmund C. Short:

(Ringing of Replica of Liberty Bell)

Ladies and Gentlemen: Welcome to this Special Commemorative Assembly and Invited Address of Division B of AERA. In this year of our nation's Bicentennial, the ringing of this little replica of the Liberty Bell calls to mind our place historically in the long human drama. It reminds us of the principles and ideals that this nation aspires to embody and which it is called upon to carry forward to each new generation -- liberty - justice - the dignity of individual human beings. We are reminded too of the enterprises of education of which we are a part and of the contribution education makes to each generation. We are reminded that both AERA and Division B have made significant contributions to the knowledge, perspectives, and purposes which undergird educational thought and practice in the U.S. and elsewhere. We wish to take a moment to commemorate these contributions and the work of these organizations. We note that this is the 60th Anniversary of AERA and the 12th Anniversary of Division B, Curriculum and Objectives.

We are met here this afternoon, not to pat ourselves on the back, but to reflect with some sense of responsibility on where we have been, where we are today, and where we are going in educational inquiry, especially that pertaining to curriculum scholarship and to the objectives of our educational interprises. We cannot recite all the specific efforts of the Association or of Division B which their members have made over the years; they are too many and we would be certain to omit many outstanding studies, concepts, and issues that have been addressed. But we do want to take time to review some of the origins of Division B and to recognize

some of the individuals who have assisted in Association work. We are not in this Association accustomed to much ceremony, so we shall be brief about this and then proceed to our invited address by Professor Huebner.

It is my pleasure to present to you, first of all, Nate Gage, who was the president of AERA in 1963-64 and who can tell us a little bit about how AERA's divisional structures came into being, in case some of you were not a part of that at that time.

Nathaniel Gage:

Thank you, Dr. Short. I am not a professional historian; I do have files. I spent last Saturday afternoon in those files having an orgy of nostalgia. I have here a letter dated October the 7th, 1964, to Professors Goodlad and Smith. "Dear John and Bunnie: Because neither of you were able to get to the AERA Executive Committee Meetings on October 3rd and 4th, Lee Cronbach asked me to take notes on decisions and other matters concerning AERA's divisions." One paragraph says, "Your division can have $100 to spend before next February." There are other equally momentous propositions in this correspondence.

My lack of training as an historian will make this presentation somewhat disorderly. Let me begin with what the by-laws of the Division on Curriculum and Objectives have to say on the objectives of this division. Now this was true on April the 15th, 1965; whether it is still true, I am not informed. But anyway,

> "Article 1. The objectives of the Division on Curriculum and Objectives are to: (1) advance theory and research in curriculum as a field of study; (2) maintain a high level of problem identification and research methodology; (3) encourage the use of sound theory and research in curriculum practice; (4) promote the application of knowledge of curriculum affairs to educational issues of our society."

That's all it says on the objectives of the Division.

I think the concern with divisions in AERA began under the administration of David Ryans who preceded me by two years as president of AERA. The organization, I guess, at that point was close to about 1,800 members in size, and some kind of internal structuring according to divisions was in the air. The members were restive; they weren't having enough opportunity to interact with other members with similar interests. Discussions began according to my records in 1961. They continued during the term of office of Walter Cook, who died in the fall of 1963 while I was president-elect. So I took over the chairmanship of the Executive Committee that fall, and David Ryans was called back from his retirement as president of AERA to serve on the Executive Committee again to make a full complement. The members at that time consisted of me, as president-elect, who suddenly became president more quickly than I should have. David Ryans, called back from retirement, Lee Cronbach as president-elect-elect, who became president-elect, and two members at large, E. F. Lindquist and John Flanagan; and it was we who carried on the discussions based on the noises we were hearing from the membership and on our own ideas. Shortly, a committee on the divisional organizational procedure was appointed with Chester Harris, who had been president the year before Ryans, as chairman, and four other members who represented four different fields of what were even then lurking in our minds as the basic initial divisions of AERA. The four other members, and I'll leave it to you to guess what fields we had in mind for them to represent, were Daniel Griffiths, John Mayor, David Ryans, and David Tiedeman. That committee issued a report, which I have here in the form of a thermofax copy. I have here, in addition to much else, a recommended initial divisional structure, the most interesting part of which, I think, is the rationale

for the structure that we finally adopted. This is the thinking of that committee under its chairman, Chester Harris. Here it is; it is about a page and half long.

> "The Divisional Planning Committee recommends that the divisional structure of the Association be initiated with the following five divisions, listed in alphabetical order: Administration, Curriculum and Objectives, Learning and Instruction, Measurement and Research Methodology, Student Development and Personnel Services. Since it is possible to develop several different frameworks as guides to divisional structure, we present a brief discussion at this point of the rationale for recommending this particular set of five titles.
>
> Since divisions are seen as means of furthering the objectives of the association and since the objectives of the Association emphasize the promotion and conduct of educational research, we believe that a proper divisional structure should be described in terms that are related to and emphasize the goals, the methods, and the distinct problems of educational research. On these grounds we would reject any divisional structure that focuses on the levels of education, such as elementary, secondary, college, adult, etc. Terms describing levels of education are useful for some purposes but leave much to be desired in descriptions of goals or problems of educational research.
>
> Another kind of framework for describing education, is that of the subject matter in the teaching field, such as science, social studies, arithmetic, etc. Again, these are useful terms for some purposes but we see the proper emphasis of the Association to be on problems of educational research that are not necessarily confined to one subject matter field any more than they are confined to one level of education. Still another possible framework would be to identify disciplines or fields of study that presumably are basic to the study of and/or the conduct of education. Thus some might propose a divisional structure using terms like psychology, anthropology, history, philosophy, etc. We believe that the use of such terms as a framework for our divisional structure would be unfortunate in view of the strong existing associations designed to promote the interests of scholars in each of those fields. We are pleased that many members of our Association also belong to these other associations. We would warn against any attempt to duplicate, in our formal divisional structure, these other associations.
>
> The initial divisional structure that we recommend can be derived from an analysis of the major

> tasks or activities in the conduct of education. These tasks are: administering the educational enterprise, developing curriculum and objectives, instructing and teaching, evaluating and measuring, and guiding and counseling students. Each of these major tasks sets fairly definite research problems that can be distinguished by reasonable persons without being claimed to be completely independent. Each of these major tasks is at least of some importance at all levels of education and for most subject matter areas.
>
> Further, these tasks often set research problems, and for their adequate solution, demand the insights and knowledge of methods of attack characteristic of the basic disciplines. It is for these reasons that we believe that the initial divisional structure that we recommend provides not only a distinctive framework of divisions for an association that is devoted to educational research, but also divisions in which most members can find their interests reflected. As the Association continues to grow and develop the adequacy of this view of the proper framework for a divisional structure will be tested. We urge that this framework be given a fair trial before being abandoned or attenuated by the introduction of other principles of organization such as levels, teaching fields, disciplines, etc."

That is the genesis of this Division.

Edmund C. Short:

Next, I call upon Vernon Anderson, who, as you can see by your program, was a member of the Organizing Committee of Division B during the year 1963-64. He will try to sketch for us a little bit about what was done at that time and indicate from his own personal experience in that process something of what was going on.

Vernon Anderson:

Thank you, Ed. I'm speaking for two other members who should have been here, John Mayor and Robert Gagné, who are both on the East Coast and could not make it for this meeting. I'll try to give you an overview. As Nate Gage did, I went to primary sources (I'm not an historian either). I had to go to three sources of information to get the story, and it is still a little bit confusing. I suspect that Nate Gage's files in his garage

contain the best evidence and probably could fill in the gaps that I found. One source was from the AERA files that Ed Short sent to me; one was from John Mayor's files, and one was from my own files at the University of Maryland. I'm speaking only of the years 1963-64, and I'm speaking, I guess, for another generation. I think I'm safe in saying that. I haven't seen any data out on the average age of the membership. If you look around the membership of this conference you see that probably around thirty years separates those of us who were actively involved in the beginning and those of you who are active now in the organization. Perhaps that is one of the main factors for it's being such a vital organization today.

I want to pay some tribute to those who had a part in the beginning, talk to you a little bit about the organization, and then read to you the original purpose of the division, which is not too different from the one that Nate read.

I would like to mention the University of Maryland's part in it because it relates both to the AERA as well as to Division B, and I think I can do that safely because I'm not connected with the University anymore but with the International University at San Diego. The University of Maryland was responsible for assisting the AERA in getting underway with its first full-time secretary, a joint appointment with the University of Maryland, J. R. Gerberich. I had carried on negotiations with Frank Hubbard who was one of the leaders at the time. He was Associate Secretary for Information Services at NEA and exercised a great deal of leadership in this organization.

Persons who were most influential in the organization of the division would be the two presidents, Nate Gage and Lee Cronbach, because those are the years 1963 in which the planning of the organization occurred and 1964 in which the actual organization got under way. C. W. Harris,

mentioned by Nate Gage as chairman of the divisional planning committee, was another person who certainly had a part to play that was very important. I think the one who had the most important part directly was John Mayor. He was chairman of the Organizing Committee for Curriculum and Objectives. That was the exact title that I get from the letters and other documents that I have. And Robert Gagné and I were the other two members of this Organizing Committee. Then there was Kenneth Hovet, whose name is not included on your list, but who was, and this is authenticated, chairman of the first program committee of the Division. The University of Maryland's participation you can see here too, because John Mayor, who at the time was Director of Education for the American Association for the Advancement of Science, was also Visiting Professor of Mathematics and Mathematics Education at the University of Maryland; Robert Gagné was our consultant in working with the new math programs and research in hierarchies. Much of that work he's published was done at the University of Maryland. Clayton L. Stunkard, Professor of Research and Measurements at the University of Maryland was a member of the second nominating committee for the first nomination. I'll get into that in a moment. I was involved as Dean of the College of Education at the time.

I'm just going to try to generalize a bit and you'll have to take it for granted that I have some evidence that appears in the documents. I would say this Division was born in confusion and then developed into a strong arm of the AERA, along with the AERA itself. And that's documented in a number of statements that Mayor made in his correspondence. (See Appendix A). He talks about a fumbling start, and he says in one place "it appears that the whole question of nominations is unclear" and again he refers to the confusion of the first meeting in February, 1964, at the AERA Conference. But, I want to read you a statement that he makes

that is an extremely interesting one I think. He has prepared a six page document from his checking into the archives entitled, "How the Division of Curriculum and Objectives started."

"During those 18 years," and he talks about 18 years when he was with the AAAS, "I had the opportunity to watch quite closely the program and the work of both scientific and educational organizations. It seems to me that none of these organizations has made the significant progress in the past twenty years that is the record of the American Educational Research Association. This reflects growth in membership, but much more importantly, it reflects the services and nature of the AERA programs. I believe, personally, that one of the strengths of the AERA has come from the division organization that we founded."

The rules of the game were changed at this point as far as nominations were concerned. It's not too clear as to who changed them, but they were changed. In the beginning this divisional organizing committee seemed to have a good deal more to say about the organization and must have been given that right by the Executive Committee. It is evident that this group took upon itself to establish the procedures for nominations and elections. These procedures were that there was to be a nominating committee appointed for each division by the chairman of the Divisional Organization Committee. John Mayor appointed Robert Gagné, Clayton L. Stunkard and me, as chairman, to be the nominating committee. We nominated John Mayor and Kenneth Hovet for vice-president, George Beauchamp and B. O. Smith for secretary.

Previous to the February 1964 meeting, when the elections were to be held at the divisional meetings, protests came to Dr. Gerberich over this procedure. President Gage suggested that the Executive Committee establish the election procedure at the February meeting, which was done. At that point the Executive Committee took over on the elections. The

Executive Committee in February set up the following procedure: the divisional organizing chairman, in each case, was to appoint a nominating committee of three members to nominate at least two candidates for each position with an opportunity for the members to add additional nominations. Anyone nominated by three or more members was put on the final ballot. Now, it so happens that there were seven additional candidates for vice-president of Division B put on the ballot because they were nominated by 3 or more members. But since the 32 additional names who were proposed for the office of secretary didn't carry more than one or two names, there were none added, although I have not been able to find the final ballot. On the preferential ballot it is of course clear that John Goodlad was elected as first vice-president and Bunnie Smith, the first secretary. I don't think Bunny minds my saying this: as one more bit of evidence of the confusion, he says he doesn't remember that he was the first secretary. The organizing committee was dismissed, and the new officers took over in July, 1964.

Finally, I want to read to you the purposes of the Division which I think, if you look over the Division program, the fine program that Ed Short has arranged here this year, that these purposes are being carried out, at least to a great extent. This is the statement that was developed by John, Robert Gagné, and me.

> "The Division of Curriculum and Objectives is devoted to the promotion of research in curriculum and objectives. The purposes of the division are to be accomplished through presenting research reports at annual meetings, associating the publication of research studies, identifying and encouraging young research workers, stimulating interdisciplinary approaches to research in curriculum, cooperating with other groups and organizations active in and concerned with research in curriculum, fostering the interpretation of research in curriculum and objectives for school practice, and increasing public understanding and appreciation of the importance and problems of curriculum research in the improvement of education."

That was the beginning of Division B.

Edmund C. Short:

In looking back, of course, some things impress one more than others and I'll let you draw your own conclusions. But we all need to think about where we are at the present time. I might ask in the perspective of 1976 that we look at AERA twelve years later. I can think of no one who is better prepared to see where we stand now than our Executive Officer, Bill Russell.

William Russell:

Now that I have had an opportunity to hear these reports, I understand why the Association's archival files are inadequate; we don't have many records of the past. I suspect if we searched the homes of past officers, the archives would be more complete.

When Ed invited me to say a few words at this session; I took him very literally. He said if I could be brief it would be appreciated, and I assured him that was a request I could honor.

If I may, allow me to go back to the beginning to gain a perspective of where I think we are now. That is, to 1915 when a group of eight men attending a meeting of the Department of Superintendents met in Cincinnati over dinner to establish the National Association of Directors of Educational Research. That was the predecessor to the current organization. It established only two objectives: to foster the establishment of independent departments of educational research in local education agencies; to promote the practical (and that was underscored) use of educational measurement and educational research. As you would expect in the formative stages of the Association's development there was a school-based or practitioner orientation in AERA. Discussions of the executive board in those years were concerned

with the imbalance in the type of Association members. As I review the Association council meetings of the last few years, there is still a concern over an imbalance, but I suspect you realize in which way the imbalance now occurs.

The following year, 1916, witnessed the first Annual Meeting program, which consisted of a dinner attended by twelve individuals and the establishment of the Educational Research Bulletin. Of interest was the requirement that voting members submit one article a year to the newsletter or be demoted to associate membership. I'm sure Dick Schutz (current editor of the ER) would appreciate that provision because of his continual need for manuscripts. On the Association's tenth anniversary the minutes indicate the registrants came to AERA to hear the latest about education. "They use the radio in classrooms." In 1930, AERA became a department within NEA and remained there, you may recall, until 1967. The following year, 1931, the Review of Educational Research was established. After 25 years, 1940, the Association had a membership of less than 500 members. Interest increased in the Annual Meeting each year, and there was discussion that the growth of the program was so large that it was becoming fragmented. Divisional section meetings were not well attended. The consensus of the Executive Committee at that time was that they should reconsider the format of the meeting. There should be fewer sessions, the program should concentrate on sessions of broad interest to the membership, and the central purpose of the conference should be to coordinate the fields of educational research and development. That discussion has been repeated in recent Council meetings. If we skip a few years to the '60's, one can note a spirit of optimism in the field -- the years of both increased federal support and of the faith of the government and others in the "magic of educational research and development," as a solution to very complex problems.

As I considered what I might say today, I thought it would be appropriate

to look back at 1964 in a few quantitative terms. The distinguished members at this table are in a much better position than I to comment on the substantive changes in the field over the past few years. The Association's budget is now approximately ten times what it was in 1964. The dues were $15, compared with our present rate of $25. The membership was just over 3,000, and that was a significant increase in 1964 because of the previous year's promotion involving Phi Delta Kappa members which attracted a little over a thousand new members. The 1964 Annual Meeting in Chicago consisted of 59 sessions attended by 1000 registrants. As mentioned earlier, this was the year the first full time Executive Officer was employed by AERA. Divisions and an Annual Meeting placement service were also established in that year.

I will conclude by observing that many of the concerns and problems of the past seem to be recurring. For example: how do we strengthen state and local departments of education; how does the research community communicate with grant or funding agencies; how do we improve the climate of educational research by making our positions known in Washington; how do we correct or accommodate an imbalance in Association membership between practitioner orientated and research orientated members; how does the Association best serve the membership and the field. These were all concerns that have been expressed over the years. A couple of differences obviously are funding levels for educational research and development were more favorable in 1964 than they are today, and perhaps there was more optimism about the promise and utility of educational research. I think it is certainly appropriate that we devote our efforts to recreate some of those aspects of our history.

I appreciate the invitation to be here today and the opportunity to be associated with AERA.

Edmund C. Short:

For a view from within the Division itself let's have some remarks from the Vice-President for the current year, Decker Walker.

Decker Walker:

When Ed was planning this Commemorative Assembly for the program this year, he and I happened to meet in a hotel in Chicago for an altogether different purpose. He was explaining to me how impressed he was with the tradition that is represented on this program sheet that you all have. It wasn't fully clear to me how impressive it was until I saw the document itself: that's quite a list of names and represents surely the most important work done in curriculum over the period covered by the list. Very impressive, indeed.

The remarks heard today, however, remind me of new history or revision of history. We learned that first, that the founders of the Division were absent at the meeting where it was founded, and that it was born in confusion, and that during its greatest period of growth it was characterized by the scandals during the nomination process. I guess that all I can say is that, as with human reproduction, it's a good thing it doesn't hinder our conscious planning or it wouldn't have gotten this far.

I want to add one final scandal to the whole operation, however. I'm not sure that this was true in the beginning so I won't accuse it of all previous Vice-Presidents in this office, but it's certainly true today. The important offices in the Association are the program committee chairmen. The important office is not the Divisional Vice-President. The Divisional program committee chairman organizes sessions, invites the invited address speaker, and generally keeps the Divisional program moving.

The Divisional Vice-President by comparison has a relatively light job to be filled with relative unimportant largely ceremonial functions such as the one I'm in right now. And I'm not sure if all my predecessors are willing to admit to the same thing, but it certainly is true today. So I'd like to close by just thanking Ed for organizing this and the whole program. I know he's not quite finished yet, and without further adieu I'll let you get on to Dwayne Huebner's invited address.

Edmund C. Short:

We do have a number of these past and present leaders here on the platform, and I do want to introduce them to you, in the order you will find them on your sheet so that you can follow along if you will. We'll be very brief about this so that we can move ahead. A number of folks who have not been able to come to San Francisco have sent their regrets.

You've met Vernon Anderson and have learned of his role in the founding of the Division. (Applause)

John Goodlad, Dean of the Graduate School of Education at UCLA, and our first Vice-President. (Applause). You will note that he later became President of AERA in 1967-68.

B. O. Smith, long-time member of faculty of the University of Illinois and now of the University of South Florida, who was as we have heard the first Division Secretary and later was Vice-President in 1967-68. (Applause).

George Beauchamp, Northwestern University, who was our Secretary from 1969-1972. (Applause).

O. L. Davis, University of Texas at Austin, who was Vice-President from 1971-1973. (Applause).

James Macdonald, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, who was our Program Chairman in 1971-72. (Applause).

Robert Stake, University of Illinois, who was our Vice-President

from 1973-75. (Applause)

Arthur W. Foshay, long-time member of the faculty of Teachers College, Columbia University, who was our Invited Speaker in 1974. (Applause)

Ulf Lundgren, Pedogogic Institute of Stockholm, who served as Program Co-Chairman in 1974-75. (Applause)

Elliot W. Eisner, Stanford University, who presented the Invited Address in 1975. (Applause)

Decker Walker, Stanford University, who is currently Vice-President for 1975-77. (Applause)

There are many in the audience who have contributed to the work of this Association and Division B as well as have these people on the platform. I think we might as well recognize you too. Let me ask for certain categories of people to stand, and we'll give you some applause, too. Every year there are a number of active committees working on the nominations, program, all kinds of things. If you have worked on any kind of committee related to Division B or the Association would you stand and admit it. (Applause) If you have worked on writing, editing, or screening manuscripts for any of the several Association journals would you stand. (Applause) I probably should have the people on the platform stand in these categories too because a great number of these people, for example, have written and served on the editorial staffs of some of our publications. How about people who presented papers? Are some of you out there? (Applause) How about some of those who may have screened papers? Would you please stand? (Applause) I suppose there are others. Is there anybody else who has done anything for the organization? (Laughter)

It's not exactly a momentous thing to receive a little bit of recognition, but we do think we have had people within the Division who have served both the organization and the broader field of curriculum scholarship well, who have made whatever contributions have been made to the field since we

began in an organized way. And we need to reflect upon their contributions and recognize them for bringing us to where we are.

I'm going to ask Arthur Foshay to say a quick word, now that all of us have been recognized. Maybe we can get a little bit of significance out of this from some remarks from Art.

Arthur Foshay:

I was remembering that John Dewey defined the present as the meeting point between the past and the future. In fact, as I recall it, he said the present is made of the past and future. So some of us here are in the past and some of us are in the future and some are in both past and future. I noticed that, for example, even the title of today's address is borrowed from one of the former addresses, the one by Joe Schwab, given to this very Division in 1969. He begins his "Language of the Practical," you will recall, with the electric comment that the curriculum field is moribund, and I suppose that will be the source of Dwayne's comments.

We do get together. I recognize so many friends here, professional friends in so many different contexts. Don't you? This is in some sense a family gathering, and I suppose that the family feeling in the Curriculum field is that which holds us together. I'm sure that the field doesn't hold itself together. (Laughter) I guess we'll hear more about that this afternoon.

On behalf of my colleagues on the platform, I thank you Ed for this recognition. (Applause)

Edmund C. Short:

I'm going to suggest that before you leave this session at the end and head over to hear Gene Glass's address tonight that you come down and greet these people in front. I'll ask them to form a receiving line so

to speak down here in front of the dias and have you greet them.

Our speaker this afternoon is a well-known curriculum theorist, Professor Dwayne Huebner of Teachers College, Columbia University. He is one of those rare scholars who reflects in his own approach to curriculum inquiry what I think Professor Marks on Monday evening was describing when he called for appropriate mixture of understanding and appreciation. Professor Huebner has acquired command of empirical and statistical tools of research during his doctoral studies at the University of Wisconsin, where he worked with Paul Eberman and Virgil Herrick, with whom he had worked earlier during some study at the University of Chicago. He soon began to read in philosophy, the mystics of the East and the West, theology, and religion, and by the time he joined the Teachers College faculty in 1957 he was into Existentialism and began to acquire the critical tools of philosophy and aesthetics which make his work so unique among curriculum scholars. His writings include: "Curriculum Language and Classroom Meanings;" "Curriculum as a Concern for Man's Temporality;" "Toward Remaking Curriculum Theory;" and among others, "The Thingness of Educational Content," a matter about which his talk this afternoon will focus in part.

The title of Professor Huebner's address, as you've already noted, is "The Moribund Curriculum Field: Its Wake and Our Work." I present to you an intellectual groundbreaker in the field of curriculum, a teacher par excellence, and a truly human being, Professor Dwayne Huebner.

Dwayne Huebner:

Thank you very much, Ed. Before I get into the body of the speech, I should say that I have prepared to go on for an hour, and if I skip and get fuzzy along the way it is because I am conscious of time. If you have some bells you want to ring, ring them, or just walkout.

Editor's Note: The version of the address that follows has been slightly extended and revised by the author following the oral presentation.

THE MORIBUND CURRICULUM FIELD:

ITS WAKE AND OUR WORK

Dwayne Huebner

The field of curriculum was diagnosed as moribund in 1969 by Professor Joseph J. Schwab.[1] The symptoms given were the incoherence of the curriculum, the failures and discontinuities within schooling, and various flights from the subject of the field. The cause of the malady was identified as the "inveterate, unexamined, and mistaken reliance on theory"--theories adopted by the field and theories constructed within the field. Professor Schwab predicted a "renascence" of the field only if curriculum energies were "diverted from theoretic pursuits" to "modes of operation" identified as the "practical, the quasi-practical, and the eclectic." In an intellectual tour de force, he then developed his theories of the arts of the practical and the arts of the eclectic. His theory of the nature of deliberation, one of the arts of the practical, is a significant contribution to those aspects of educational practice concerned with decision making and institutional governance. Even more significant is his theory of the eclectic procedures by which the diverse theories can be used in and for educational practice, while maintaining both the integrity of the theories and the practical contexts of education.[2]

Obviously, the soundness of the diagnoses is a function of the available evidence and the visibility of the symptoms. In a "field" such as "curriculum," traditionally ambiguous and replete with ideological stands, such evidence and symptoms are apt to be a function of the observer's interest. Schwab grants that his evidence is only suggested, not cited. Indeed it is too sketchy to warrant consensual validation. The opposite claim is asserted in the January 1976 issue of Educational Leadership by Professor B. O. Smith--that the curriculum movement has been and continues to be a powerful force in educational progress. He claims that from the "nebulous concepts" of "freedom, openness, activity, self-expression, and creativity" have sprung a succession of innovations; and that the very "vagueness and ambiguity" of the concepts "is their fertility."[3] He acknowledges the

---

[1]Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical: A Language for the Curriculum," School Review 78 (November 1969): 1-24.

[2]Idem, "The Practical: Arts of the Eclectic," School Review 79 (August 1971).

[3]B. Othanel Smith, "Curriculum: The Continuing Revolution," Educational Leadership (January 1976): 243-44.

Invited Address, Division B, American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 21, 1976.

An edited version of this paper is to appear in Curriculum Inquiry, 6(No. 2, 1976).

ideological and slogan function of curricular discourse. For me, his claim is warranted historically. That the curriculum field has always been made up of individuals with strong convictions certainly mitigates against my general agreement with respect to this diagnosis. From where I stand, Schwab's diagnosis carries more weight today. The poor health of the field is evidenced by the general lack of vitality within the publications of the field and the national conferences; by the failure of so-called curriculum specialists or leaders to make impact on the national debate about educational programs; and by the general state of the schools, at least those within my ken.

Professor Schwab is not alone in identifying the cause of the "field's" difficulty with the use of "theory." Professor Decker Walker, in his fine critical review of the 26th Yearbook of the NSSE, takes a similar stand. He claims that the foundations of the field which were laid in the 1920s and 1930s were inadequate or unsound, and that one of the reasons was that the members of the NSSE committee "attempted to resolve practical disputes--disputes over what should be done about the curriculum--as if they were theoretical disputes...."[4] Walker, like Schwab, makes valid prescriptions, one of which is that curriculum discourse should be disciplined by actual policy debates in concrete educational situations. Without such focus, "curricular discourse lacks point." Walker grants the potential oversimplification of his claim, yet argues, and rightfully I believe, that greater attention to the mechanisms and procedures of curriculum policy-making would be an expedient corrective.

That theory is the cause of the problem is convincingly established by neither Schwab nor Walker. Both state that theoretic discourse seeks to establish truth, whereas practical discourse seeks to establish right or appropriate action. Surely, Schwab is establishing or proclaiming a truth with respect to the curriculum field as he offers his diagnoses and prescriptions. I must acknowledged being influenced by different traditions of late, and would not find support for their distinctions between theoretical and practical discourse within the positions taken by Heidegger, later Wittgenstein, the Critical Theorists or Alan Blum. I would hasten to add that I too find much ineffective discourse within the curriculum field. I don't think that it is ineffective because it is theoretical; it is ineffective because it accomplishes little in this social world, it has little use value. The problem is the near total autonomy of educational practice and educational language. Educational practice too often is unconnected to the legitimating and descriptive powers of language, and educational discourse is too often unconditioned by educational practice, except the practice of college classrooms and educational conventions. The source of the problem is, in part, and to use a Piagetian notion, that formal educational language is not grounded in the schemas of educational operations.

I am also less sanguine about Schwab's prognosis. I sense no grounds for hope of a renascence, although I wish for a reincarnation in simpler and more original form. If the publication of Bobbitt's Curriculum can be interpreted as the act of independence which distinguishes the newly matured from childhood and youth, then these past ten to fifteen years can be considered the golden years. The end is here. Many individuals and groups, with their diverse intentions, have

---

[4]Decker F. Walker, "Straining to Lift Ourselves," Curriculum Theory Network 5 (January 1975): 4.

gathered together under this now aged parent, "curriculum." Let us now acknowledge the demise, and while we are gathered at this wake, celebrate joyously what our forebears made possible and then disperse to do our work. We are no longer members of one household. The term "curriculum" serves no longer to unify and hold us together. The dispersing forces are too great; the attraction of new associations and the possibilities of new households too compelling. The people need our diverse capabilities, but if our energies continue to be applied to holding together our diverse intentions and collectivities, then we will have no energies left to serve them. A clearing away of the diverse interests and collectivities that have been gathering over the past seventy years or so might enable us to see more clearly the original framework of "curriculum" and do and speak our work more effectively.

The historical groundwork which is so necessary for us to clear away these many interests is lacking, as writer after writer has pointed out to us for many years. The few historical studies that we do have helped us with our general orientation in time, but as yet we do not have the critical histories so necessary for reinterpreting what we have been about and suggesting the work that is before us. Walker does this in his Curriculum Theory Network reviews of the 26th Yearbook. Sequel's The Curriculum Field: Its Formative Years helps in our orientation to the basic literature of the field and the early forerunners in the field. Kliebard has helped us to see the relationship between the work of Bobbitt, Charters and Tyler, and the efficiency movement associated with Taylor in the first decades of this century. Cremin has called our attention to the significance of William Torrey Harris as a precursor of the field, usually ignored by the curriculum person. Barry Franklyn is developing the relationship between the curriculum field and the interest in social control as it was expressed in the twenties. The crucial period, it seems to me, is not the past sixty years. I think that Cremin is correct, that the basic paradigm was established in the post-Civil War period and that the work of Harris is extremely significant in this establsihment. He states:

> Education, Harris once explained in a brief statement of his pedagogical creed, is a process "by which the individual is elevated into the species," or alternately, a process by which a self-active being is enabled to become privy to the accumulated wisdom of the race. And it is the task of the curriculum to make that accumulated wisdom economically and systematically available. "The question of the course of study--involving as it does the selection of such branches as shall in the most effective manner develop the substantial activity as well as the formal activity of the child--is the most important question which the educator has before him."
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The instrument of the process would be the textbook, which Harris saw as the pedagogical tool par excellence in a newspaper civilization where public opinion ruled and where the entire community needed access to similar facts and arguments if harmony was to be achieved. The energizer of the process would be the teacher, who would use the recitation to get the pupil to deliberate over what he has read and to relate it to his own life. And

> the monitor of the process would be the examination, whereby pupils could be frequently classified and then moved individually through a carefully graded system.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> All the pieces were present for the game of curriculum-making that would be played over the next half-century; only the particular combinations and players would change.[5]

But identifying the paradigm as originating with Harris does not reveal the problem to which we must now attend, which is to locate those interests which can be considered essential to the curriculum and those which are strong enough to have their own autonomy, or which might more profitably be associated with other segments of the educational enterprise.

I find it helpful to begin with the meaning of the word "curriculum." The word points to diverse, perhaps even paradoxical, intentions of educators. It is loaded with ambiguity. It lacks referential precision, pointing, in general, only to educational programs within schools. The political significance of educational programs and the ambiguity of the word "curriculum" encourages programmatic definitions[6] of the word and its frequent use in educational slogans.[7] These programmatic and slogan possibilities have served to collect or bring together educators or individuals with diverse educational interests, who use it to legitimate their programmatic interests in the content of the school. Since the 1900s the "curriculum" family has included those interested in content, method, teacher education, human development and freedom, social progressivism or conservatism, educational technology, evaluation, and educational objectives or purposes. These diverse interest groups have made their impact, in one way or another, on our ways of practicing and speaking "curriculum." However, it seems to me that the word can no longer hold together such diversity. Meetings of curricular specialists and departments of curriculum lack focus and "curricular" discourse is losing or has lost its effectiveness. Our solution to this problem is not to cast dispersions on our discourse by labeling it theoretical, but to sort out the different interests expressed in our discourse.

Some of the interests which have been collected under the term "curriculum," such as curriculum development, have served their function and now require relocation within other practices of education. Others, such as those which took on the label "child-centered curriculum," have distorted the way our work is understood and confused our intentions by covering inherent tensions or contradictions. Our task here is to speak clearly so the contradictions remain visibly nagging before us. Other interests, such as interests in society as content, have fundamentally altered the very nature of our work, but the language we use inadequately describes the work we do or which needs to be done.

---

[5]Lawrence A. Cremin, "Curriculum-Making in the United States," Teachers College Record 73 (December 1971): 208-10.

[6]Israel Scheffler, The Language of Education (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1960), pp. 19-25.

[7]B. Paul Komisar and James E. McClellan, "The Logic of Inquiry," in Language and Concepts of Education, eds. B. Othanel Smith and Robert H. Ennis (Chiago: Rand McNally & Co., 1961), pp. 195-215.

My central thesis is that we accept, as the core of our work, that which is entailed in the root meaning of "curriculum"[8]--that we attend to the course of study. We must, of course, be careful not to become entangled in the historically limited meanings of that term, or to refer only to that which was written in a syllabus, for we all know that that which is studied is not simply what is written down in a syllabus. Dewey warns us of this limitation in Democracy and Education when he reminds us that "We never educate directly, but indirectly by means of the environment."[9]

Our problem is one of exploring the nature of the course of study--of content --and of eliminating the interests which do not bear directly upon this content. A return to Harris and Dewey will help focus our problem and place in perspective the interests of some of those who hovered around this work.

In 1870, before the National Educational Association in Cleveland, Harris stated:

> The state of human nature only exists as a product of culture....To achieve his destiny, to become aught that is distinctively human, he must be able to combine with his fellow man and sum up the results of the race in each individual.[10]
>
> . . . . . .
>
> It is not necessary for each member of the human family to repeat in detail the experience of all his predecessors, for their results descend to him by the system of combination in which he lives, and by education he acquires them. With these he may stand on top of the ladder of human culture, and build a new round to it so that his children after him may climb higher and do the like.[11]

Harris moved very quickly from this concern for "culture" or the "wisdom of the race" to its embodiment in books, specifically the textbook, which particularize

---

[8]As pointed out in the Oxford Dictionary, the meaning of the word "curriculum" is derived from its Latin root and refers to the running of a course. In the early 1800s it took on the meaning of a course of study or training at a school or univeristy. In many ways, the historical problem would be much easier if the root meaning--course of study--had been retained in educational discourse. To trace the embellishments and uses of that word over the past seventy years would itself be a major task--a task complicated by the expression "field of curriculum."

[9]John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: Macmillan Co., 1916: Paperback edition, 1961), p. 19.

[10]William T. Harris, The Theory of Education (Syracuse: C.W. Bardeen, 1893), pp. 17-18. The paper was originally read August 19, 1870, at the meeting of the National Educational Association in Cleveland.

[11]Ibid., pp. 21-22.

the course of study. In a later essay, delivered at the 1896 NEA meeting in Buffalo, he concisely sums up his view:

> ...the proper use of the printed page is the greatest of arts taught in the school. How to get out of the printed words and sentences the original thought and observation recorded there--how to verify these and critically go over the steps of the author's mind--this is the method of discovery and leads to the only real progress. For real progress comes from availing oneself of the wisdom of the race and using it as an instrument of new discovery. The other method sometimes commended of original investigation without aid of books forgets that mankind have toiled for long thousands of years to construct a ladder of achievement, and that civilization is on the highest round of this ladder. It has invented school education in order that youth may climb quickly to the top of the rounds which have been added one by one slowly in the lapse of the ages. The youth shall profit vicariously by the thought and experience of those who have gone before.12

He associates the origins of Western schooling with the establishment of the printing press, and seems to claim that "culture," the "wisdom of the race," is stored or made accessible in books. He fights against the rote memory of the contents of books, and makes a case for students' interpreting textual material. Today it could be said that he argues for a hermeneutical approach to the text. He distrusts the teacher's ability to make available the "wisdom of the race" by the oral method, which he associates with Pestalozzi and Rousseau. If Harris had not been extremely important in the formation of village and city graded schools as Superintendent of St. Louis from 1868 to 1880, and U.S. Commissioner of Education from 1889 to 1906, we could more easily dismiss his rhetoric.

The course of study, embodied in the text, is a selection of the culture or the "wisdom of the race," preserved and presented to the student for his interpretation and use. Underlying Harris' orientation is the technology of the book which shapes his conception of education and indeed his educational method and school organization. Print technology was part of the substructure--the economic system--that made possible his curriculum paradigm, his educational method, and the graded school organization. Harris associated culture and the wisdom of the race with the printed word. Interestingly enough, in his defense of the kindergarten methods established in St. Louis, he acknowledged the significance of language, as it is learned in the home, and the significance of play for children four through seven, particularly as it is shaped by Froebel's methods. Play stops and work begins at the age of seven for Harris. At that age confrontation with the text begins. To quote him again:

---

[12]William Torrey Harris, Horace Mann (Syracuse: C. W. Bardeen, 1896), p. 26. Originally an address delivered before the National Education Association at its meeting in Buffalo, 1896.

> By language the child arises from an animal individuality to a human individuality. By realizing his membership in society and conforming his deeds to the general standard, he develops a higher spiritual individuality. This...is the object of the kindergarten play and games. When it is achieved, the method of play gives place to the method of work; the symbolic yields to the convention; the kindergarten methods to the methods of the primary school.[13]

There are two threads in Harris which are central to our work. The first is that concern for the course of study of educational institutions is a concern for content; and that this content is derived from conceptions of "culture" or the "wisdom of the race." Harris, as he wrote about and shaped primary and post-primary education, seemed to define culture as that which was available in books (knowledge as it was unthinkingly known before Piaget and Wittgenstein).

From culture to content to course of study is the direction of our work, as seen by Harris. Although he referred to the wisdom of the race as primarily that which was to be found in books, his attention to the language of young children and play and games as appropriate content of the kindergarten seems to be an anticipation of the difficulty curriculum people have always had with respect to the word "culture." I shall argue that discourse about educational content is discourse about "culture" and that different interpretations of content since the turn of the century are, in part, contributions to the discourse about culture. That the curriculum person seemed to get caught in a distinction between culture and society, a distinction which became reasonably well fixed by the language of Parsons and other positivistically inclined social scientists, has contributed to our recent malaise. Differing interpretations of culture have confused our sense of direction and our discourse, because they have not been framed as problems of the course of study or content, but as problems of the purpose of schools. We have confused discussions about possible content with discussions of purpose. We need to be able to discuss content in such a way that we can recognize its form and its potential educational value. When we have done this, then we can consider whether we want that particular content in a particular school. However, by subsuming discourse about content under discourse about purpose, we have seldom reached clarity about the form or potential value of the content. In other words, the continued clarification of our notions of content has been hampered by the intrusion of ideological, or political, discourse into curriculum discourse.

The second thread, which shows itself in Harris and seems to me to be central to our work, is the way in which this culture is made accessible or made present for specific students. Although the expression "making present" has an uneasy qualtiy, I have consciously chosen that expression. I wish to make a distinction between having content in the presence of the young and expecting that they will somehow "master" it. Response to "content made present"--to culture--can indeed be rejection--or reinterpretation. This is the educational technology thread, which we like to think follows from the scientific developments during this century, or the few remaining years in the last century, specifically as they were applied to education and schooling. However, I am more inclined to believe

---

[13]William Torrey Harris, The Kindergarten Methods Contrasted with the Methods of the American Primary School. Publication facts unknown. Available in the Teachers College Library.

that the opposite is the case, and that the scientific interests follow from the technical interests which educators have had for years.[14] The development of the so-called scientific movement in education can be seen as an extension of the educator's interest in the technologies or techniques required for education. As with the development of any science, or indeed any body of knowledge, enlightenment of the human condition, a kind of emanicipation, is possible if these bodies of knowledge are used reflexively to interpret one's actions and history, and not simply as instruments of control. This thread will also be picked up shortly.

The other components of Harris' curriculum as identified by Cremin--the nature of the student, the function of the teacher, examinations, and school organizations--are not, for me, part of the work of the curriculum person, although they necessarily impinge upon his work in school settings. Rather, they deal with the interest of all educators in the rights and freedom of the individual, the nature of educational relationships, social control, and the management and evolution of social institutions.

Dewey also spoke to the problem of the course of study in a variety of places. I have chosen to refer to his short essay on the "Theory of the Course of Study" in Paul Monroe's 1919 edition of the Encyclopedia of Education because he so neatly summarizes his view and some of the issues.[15] He writes, during a transitional period, about the fact that the "subjects" of the school are not set and fixed, but that new subjects have been and should be introduced.[16] He recognizes, as does Harris, that "The studies represent selections and formulations of what is regarded as most important in the experience of the race, and hence most necessary for the sake of the future of society." He speaks of the studies from the external or social perspective, as well as from the perspective of the experience of the student. Dewey did not suggest that we select content by studying the child, but rather suggested how content, selected from culture, was to be formed to be useful to the child. He states, for example, that "The child's present experience and the subject matter of instruction, instead of existing as two separate worlds, one wholly psychological, the other wholly logical, represent two changing or dynamic limits of one continuous social process."[17] This, of course, is his progressive organization of subject matter. In a line which almost foreshadows an extension of Piaget's work, he states that "Children must begin naturally with simple operations, whether in cooking weaving, woodwork,

---

[14]Twenty years ago James Conant called attention to the possible origins of science in the empirical interests of the practical artisans or craftsmen. He hinted that science developed as a way to reduce the degree of empiricism in the practical arts. This hint seems supported by education. See James B. Conant, Modern Science and Modern Man (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952).

[15]John Dewey, "Theory of the Course of Study," in Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. 2, ed. Paul Monroe (New York: Macmillan Co., 1919), pp. 218-222.

[16]For an insightful discussion of the problems of curriculum change as Dewey saw it in 1901, see John Dewey, "The Situation as Regards the Course of Study." Proceedings of the Department of Superintendence, National Educational Association. Delivered at the Annual Meeting held in Chicago, Illinois, February 26-28, 1901.

[17]Dewey, "Theory of the Course of Study," p. 220.

or whatever." Instead of Piaget's genetic epistemological perspective, of course, he uses a social historical perspective--recapitulation--to describe the genesis of social knowledge in the individual. He continues, "These simple operations agree of necessity in their main features of crude material and simple tools and techniques of men in less developed, the earlier periods of social life."[18]

Dewey agrees with Harris with respect to the first thread of our work--the selection and formulation of content from the "experience of the race." He does not agree with Harris' narrow interpretation of culture, and approaches it from a significantly different view. But he does not introduce the study of the child as another source of content. From the perspective of today we could say that Dewey suggested the need for the study of the child for the second aspect of our work--to produce knowledge that could be used technically--to help make the culture present or accessible for specific students. The foreshadowing of Piaget is significant. Piaget, looking at the hypothetical-deductive and mathematical knowledge in the child, has described the structure of cultural forms in such a way that they become useful or usable for individuals of different ages. Piaget's work does not offer us a new interpretation of culture--of knowledge. Rather, he extends present interpretations into their biological or sensorimotor ground, and asks that we see the hidden form that this knowledge has, a form which we have taken for granted. In a sense he points to Polanyi's subsidiary awareness. Dewey's concern for occupations has somewhat the same quality. In the idea of occupations, he establishes the claim that adult forms of social knowledge have their genetic sources in the occupations of primitive people, and that we need other educational technologies to make them available to children.

I have used these portions of Dewey to support my claim that in our work we have two threads to which we must attend. The first is the identification of those segments of the culture, the "wisdom of the race," which can become the content of the course of study. The second is the identification of the technologies by which this content can be made accessible or made present to particular individuals. The first is a problem of describing the what, the second is identifying the know-how by which that "what" is presented for "study." This is the core of our work. If curriculum has any meaning left today, it is in the identification and the making present of content to persons.

Before we can see clearly how the other diverse interests associated with curriculum since the turn of the century relate to these two threads of our work, it is necessary to point out an inherent tension which has clouded our vision, confused our intentions, and distorted our communication and discourse. This is the basic tension between the interests of the individual and the social interests which have impact upon that individual--the phenomena of social control. As educators we feel the caughtness of this tension. On the one hand, we proclaim the dignity of the person, by speaking of self-realization, individual freedom, or individual potential. On the other, we recognize the commitment to a social order --its needs, requirements, and realities. Over the years this conflict has been resolved, presumably in a variety of ways.

---

[18]Dewey, "Theory of the Course of Study," p. 221.

In 1901, speaking of the conflict during the "last two generations of educational history," Dewey expressed the hope that educators "were nearing the close of the time of tentative, blind, empirical experimentation; that we are close to the opportunity of planning our work on the basis of a coherent philosophy of experience and of the relations of school studies to that experience, so that we can take up steadily and wisely the effort of changing the school conditions so as to make real the claims that command the assent of intelligence."[19] Thus, he based his hope for the resolution of the conflict on a unified philosophical position. In the teens and twenties the scientific movement in education offered hope that this conflict could be removed by the processes of science. In the forties, some educators hoped it could be resolved through democratic involvement of all parties. In the 1950s, Tyler, in effect, proposed that the conflict could be resolved by an adequate management system; priority among the diverse interests could be established by defining objectives and screening them through a "philosophy" of education and an articulated psychology of learning. In the late fifties and early sixties, the hope was expressed that this tension could now be solved by attention to systems analysis, or by the powers of the new-found technologies. In the late sixties and early seventies, the hope that the conflict could be resolved was shattered. Detailed attention to the history of schooling and critical studies of the relationship between the school and the social-economic order suggested that the conflict was inherent in the process of education. The two most recent critical studies to point out the manifestations of this conflict are Bowles and Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America,[20] and Sharp and Green's fascinating study of English progressive primary education, Education and Social Control.[21]

An intellectual resolution to this conflict between the interests of the person and the controlling interests of social groups is not to be found in a schema or an interpretation that hides, covers, or seeks to overcome it. Recognition that the particular conflict, even if not immediately visible to either party, is a manifestation of an essential tension between those with power and those without, enables that conflict to be used educationally for both. Dialectical thought, which seeks the historical sources of the immediate conflict, relates it to the other social-economic conditions, and uses it to project new possibilities for the powerful and the powerless, has this capability. The practical resolution of the conflict is not to be found in technical or managerial procedures which assume that conflicts can be healed with greater technical sophistication, more specific definitions of learning outcomes, or newly defined educational arts. These too frequently merely confirm the existing distribution of power, taking the shape of discipline, grades, credentials, labels, and serve only the unquestioned interests of the collective which owns or uses the techniques or arts. If the educator recognizes that conflicts of interests in schools and classrooms are manifestations of underlying social contradictions with historical and social-economic origins, then they can be accepted as an impetus to change through political action, not educational action.

---

[19]Dewey, "Situation as Regards the Course of Study," pp. 164-65.

[20]Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1976).

[21]Rachel Sharp and Anthony Green, Education and Social Control (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975).

Rather than mediate, in any way, between the presumed interests of the student and the expressed interest of social groups, we should struggle to keep these inherently contradictory interests distinct and separate. Curriculum during the past six decades of this century lost the vision of its work, in part, because it assumed that the contradiction could be solved by appropriate educational practices.

As we look back over the diverse interests associated with curriculum in the literature of the past seventy years, four questions or concerns should direct our intention: (1) How have the interested parties handled the inherent contradictions between the controlling social interests and the liberating or emancipating thrusts which dwell in each person? (2) Have the interested parties provided new interpretations of content of culture? (3) Have the interested parties contributed to the development of new technologies by which content is made present to persons of differing circumstances? (4) Have the interested parties confused our work by pointing to other dimensions of the educational totality which should be associated with other practical educational concerns? A brief look at the study of the person as related to the literature of curriculum will illustrate these points.

As pointed out earlier, Dewey's concern for the child, although he did not so express it, can be seen, retrospectively, as a contribution to the technology of curriculum. In the educational enterprise, child study can be interpreted as the search for scientifically based technical knowledge. The child study and child centered curriculum movement, however, distorted the concern for content and the reinterpretation of culture. It did so by ignoring the contradiction between child and established social interests and romanticizing the child. A quick and superficial judgment would point to the influence of Kilpatrick in this distortion. If the contradiction is an inherent one, in which specific conflicts are to be analyzed dialectically and synthesized politically, then the taking on of this interest in the welfare of the student as a curriculum concern weakened both our work and the political work that is to be done. Interest in the welfare of the student need not, nay should not, be taken over by those who work at the identification and presentation of culture as educational content. We show that interest by the way we make content useful to him. However, the child-centered curriculum thrusts of the early part of this century had other impacts upon the curriculum. For instance, the child study movement associated with Prescott's work in the late forties was a means by which teachers and educators could reflect upon the influence of their behavior on young people. It made possible self-reflection and the deepening of self-awareness of the adult. Studying the child became, reflexively, a way of studying oneself. The controlling interests which dominate schooling easily distorted this self-reflective quality of child study, as it does of reinforcement theory and behavior modification, and increased the possibilities of adult control of the student. Works such as Demause's [22] and others that place the adult-young relationship in historical perspective assist the educator in maintaining the priority of self-reflection as a major educational significance of child study.[23]

---

[22]Lloyd Demause, "The Evolution of Childhood," The History of Childhood (New York: Psychology Press, 1974).

[23]See Josiah Royce, "Is There a Science of Education," Educational Review 1 (January 1891): 15-24.

In terms of our work, the child study movement and the burgeoning child development literature manifest one interest which belongs to our work and two which do not. Direct scientific knowledge of the child can be a technical resource for the reinterpretation and presentation of culture--educational content to the child--as Piaget's work so clearly demonstrates. We are in need of more studies of genetic "culture," paralleling Piaget's concerns for the scientific and logical. Those child study interests which show themselves as care for the child's development, his creativity, his power, and self-realization can be fostered more directly by political movements which recently took the form of child advocacy. The educator who mistakenly considers love and sensitivity to people a curriculum issue clouds our work and defuses the political struggle for justice. This interest needs to be disassociated from the traditions of curriculum and associated with other human rights movements. Although I see the knowledge about the child or the young serving our interests in the more effective "making present" of culture for the student, it can also be used technically by social interests for further control and manipulation of the student. The corrective to this controlling tendency is not to assume that the good intentions of the curriculum person and educator--his presumed altruism --will protect the child. We have no strong case for hoping this. In fact, there are those who have claimed that increased national spending for the behavioral sciences is, if not directly motivated by the need for social control, at least indirectly motivated by this need. The increased specialization of labor in education which presumably produces more knowledge about the child, in effect increases the number of experts who study the child, falsely promises that such expertise will liberate the child, reduces the social demand for fairness and justice in the schools, and probably obstructs the development of those social interest groups which could serve in the child's interest as advocates in educational conflict and governance. The refusal, a few years ago, in some black communities to permit educators to further study the children in those communities, is a case in point.

The second interest associated with child study is an interest in self-understanding. It belongs more properly to the humanities, not to the curriculum. Any new knowledge is humanistic--serves as a source of self-understanding--if used reflexively. The study of the child and attention to his development with adults sheds as much light on the adult and his world as upon the child's world; it informs our lived-out philosophies, religions, and social-political orientations, and thus functions as an aspect of liberal--or liberating--education.

Another interest has been associated with curriculum over the past fifty years--the interest in aspects of social life as potential educational content, which has broadened our interpretation of content, and consequently our interpretation of culture. However, the interest in social content has also distorted our work in two ways. The first distortion is that the argument about social content has been cast in ideological terms as an argument about the function of the school. In specific social-historical contexts this argument is a necessary and critical part of policy-making and hence legitimate discourse which precedes and accompanies the politics of educational governance. However, as discourse about curriculum, this ideological tack hides the question as to how social content is to be made present for the student, and how it is related to other equally appropriate forms of educational content. Both the policy clarification problem and the technical problem are hidden by ideological components. The second distortion is that the argument has been cast in curriculum literature

as a philosophical argument between the perennialists-essentialists and the reconstructionists-experimentalists. This does a disservice to developments in modern philosophy and social thought, as well as to the clarification of our work as educators concerned with content.

Bobbitt called attention to the social as educational content, and attempted to develop a technology by which this content could be made present for students of different circumstances. The technology was not refined until recently, partly because of the ideological and pseudo-philsophical issue. With the advent of systems analysis and video-technologies, the technology of social content is again being worked at, as the diverse competency based movements indicate. Philosophical support for the interest in the social as "culture"--as content--which was earlier developed on the foundations of Linton's anthropology by Smith, Stanley and Shores in their valuable and deservedly well-known 1950 volume,[24] is today found, for example, in Alfred Schutz's The Structures of the Life-World,[25] an application of the methods of phenomenology to the social world. Schutz makes the distinction between the knowledge structures of everydayness and those of the sciences and logical systems. If culture is interpreted as the "wisdom of the race," it seems quite evident that that wisdom exists not only in symbolic structures, but in all sorts of traditions and institutions. Given this awareness, the problem of content is one of asking how diverse traditions are made educationally accessible to persons in differing circumstances. In one sense, then, social content, whether that of conservatives such as Bobbitt, or reconstructionists such as Smith, Stanley and Shores, added to the reinterpretation of content--of culture. Ignored in Bobbitt's analysis, but present in that of Smith, Stanley and Shores, is the problem of how culture, in its various manifestations, evolves and changes. The competency based movement, so similar in some ways to the social activity analysis of Bobbitt, often ignores this aspect, and thus errs on the side of the status quo interests of the collective. Social content requires a distinction similar to that identified for symbolic content by Schwab[26]--the syntax of stable inquiry and the syntax of long-term or fluid inquiry.

The social content made present to the student is frequently something to which one must adjust--the syntax of stable inquiry--rather than a field of political possibilities requiring historical and political skills--the long-term syntax of social life. The fact that each person is an historical agent is hidden by the language of socialization and learning. Once again, the inherent contradiction between social interests and the interests of the young, and its power-based resolution in favor of dominant collectives, has hidden the content problem--our work--by framing the problem as ideological or philosophical.

---

[24] B. Othanel Smith, William O. Stanley, J. Harlan Shores, Fundamentals of Curriculum Development (Yonkers-on-the-Hudson: World Book Co., 1950). I am using the word "culture" differently than they did.

[25] Alfred Schutz and Thomas Luckman, The Structures of the Life-World. Translated by Richard Zaner and H. Tristram Engelhardt, Jr. (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973).

[26] Joseph Schwab, "The Structure of the Natural Sciences," in The Structure of Knowledge and the Curriculum, eds. G. W. Ford and Lawrence Pugno (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1964).

Another interest which became attached to "curriculum," with significant impact on the thirties and forties, was the concern for curriculum change. Caswell's important work in Virginia in the thirties, and Miel's excellent 1946 Changing the Curriculum, are exemplars of this interest, although the interest can be traced back forty or fifty years earlier. Caswell and Miel, and their many colleagues interested in curriculum change, did much to stimulate the involvement of teachers, laity, and students in the developments of new educational programs. Their work recognized that educational content in schools and the way that that content was made present to students, was out of tune with what was known and valued by educators. They addressed themselves to how particular schools and particular teachers could vitalize the educational program of a school and make it more appropriate to the setting, the time, and the clients. This is an interest that received, and continues to receive, major attention in the literature associated with curriculum. From the perspective of today, informed in part by the post-Sputnik era during which new content was developed by people and groups outside the traditions of curriculum, I would say that the concern for curriculum change which has become a major preoccupation within the existing field, has pulled us away from our work--our concern for making content present to students. The interest in curriculum change is a concern more directly related to the life of institutions--how institutions maintain vitality, flexibility, and responsiveness. By placing the responsibility for curriculum change--institutional vitality--within the traditions of curriculum rather than within the traditions of administration and school governance, the problems of content were separated from the problems of budget, personnel, policies, resources, and the logistics of schooling. Those concerned with content had to be concerned with institutional vitality, yet often lacked responsibility for economic, logistical and other governance matters. Content and program would be contained in discourse over objectives, often unrelated to discourse about budget, personnel and other policy matters. Policy-making became an administrative responsibility and was frequently uninformed by the nature of content. The interests in supervision and curriculum development have confused our work--our concerns for content. Educators thought that they were doing curriculum work when they brought about change within a school, whether a change in organization or a change in program. However, these interests in institutional development, institutional flexibility, and the social organization of schools to maintain responsiveness are more appropriately seen as interests in institutional governance, and would now be more effectively associated with or seen as functions of administration or public policy-making.

The "curriculum field" as it has been constituted over the past one hundred years, is not moribund. It is, for all practical purposes, dead. It did not die because it depended on theory rather than practice, although it might have diagnosed its sickness sooner if there had been greater correspondence between its language and its practice. It died because the increasing diversity of interests that it tried to carry during those hundred years could not be held together by a single focus. There can be no renascence, because the field as it now constitutes itself, has no unity or integrity. We might speak of a possible reincarnation if we discover some interests that now have autonomy, or can be readily associated with other practical interests, and return to our roots, which are to be found in the original meaning of the word "curriculum." Perhaps the word is unimportant. Our work is identifying educational content, and finding ways to make it available to young people.

This work requires an awareness of how content is related to culture, or traditions, and how the meanings of content and culture have changed as our predecessors attended to new or different content for the schools, and will continue to change. Identifying aspects of culture which could be educational content requires greater precision of the language used to talk about culture as content. This work also requires awareness that choices of educational content are policy matters. Discourse about content should indeed be framed with the care that policy debate requires, as Walker suggests.

The second aspect of our work is making content present for or accessible to students. This is primarily a matter of educational technology. The various sciences which have become associated with education, such as learning theory, child development, cognitive psychology, are most appropriately seen as technical tools for making the valued content present or available for students, not great truths about the human being.

This technological thread of our work has developed greater power and significance during the past twenty years than any other interest associated with the "curriculum field." Unfortunately, so-called curriculum people have been quite willing to associate technology with media and developing system theory, rather than to interpret it as the necessary technology by which our work is given useful form. If the history of the curriculum field were written with a materialistic bias rather than an idealistic bias, the impact of educational technology on what we have been about could more readily be seen. Without adequate clarity about educational content, and about the inherent tensions between the individual and the collective interests, the technical tools now available--in the form of method, evaluation, and media--are easily co-opted by collectives interested in social control. Educational technology can serve either the interests of the person or the interests of a collective. The specific form this contradiction takes in a specific situation can be used politically. Whether it serves the interests of the person or the interests of the collective depends upon the educator's political commitments and his skills of dialectical analysis and political action.

Edmund C. Short:

Thank you, Dwayne. Two of our members have agreed to respond to Dwayne's address. First, let me call upon Eric Straumanis of Denison University.

THE SCOPE OF OUR WORK: REPLY TO DWAYNE HUEBNER

Eric Straumanis
Denison University

Let me begin by stating what I take Professor Huebner to assert regarding the status of the field of Curriculum. After that I shall indicate the points on which we are in agreement and then I shall argue some of the issues on which we apparently disagree or on which I think clarification is needed. Professor Huebner either explicitly makes the following claims or gives evidence that he would agree with them.

(1) Unexamined and mistaken reliance on theory is not (contra Schwab) the cause of the ill health of the field of Curriculum.

(2) The reason for the near-total ineffectiveness of the field is, not any gap between theory and practice, but rather the failure of Curriculum theorists to generate intellectual products which can be utilized by curriculum developers and users.

(3) The root cause of the field's failure to generate usable products is the long-standing preoccupation in Curriculum with the pursuit of diverse interests which, though they impinge on the proper work of Curriculum, are not part of the essential core of that work.

(4) The core of work in Curriculum should consist in two threads: (a) that marked out by the concept of course of study or content (concepts entailed by the root meaning of 'curriculum') and (b) the ways or technologies of making content accessible or present for specific students. These two threads are taken by Professor Huebner to be much narrower than the wide and indeterminate domain marked out by the concept of curriculum.

(5) In order to reveal, isolate, and effectively pursue the core work in Curriculum, issues such as the following will have to be relegated either to other fields in Education or to fields outside Education: teacher education, human development and freedom, social progressivism vs. conservatism, evaluation, educational objectives or purposes, individual rights, the nature of educational relationships, social control, the management and evolution of social institutions, curriculum change and curriculum development.

(6) The worker in Curriculum should not only avoid directly or primarily addressing non-central issues such as the preceding, but should also prevent the core work from becoming essentially affected by "ideological disputes" such as those over the nature of the distinction between culture and society, and the proper reconciliation of individual and collective interests. When work in Curriculum is permitted to become shaped by such disputes we run the risk of hiding or covering over the need for two different kinds of action: (a) the provision of technical resources or services, and (b) direct political advocacy. This hiding or covering over takes the form of Curriculum policies which attempt

to reconcile the irreconcilable or to meliorate irremediable tensions between different role bearers or social groups. Such policies put the field of Curriculum at the service of those who are interested in maintaining the status quo through social pacification.

* * * * *

If we interpret the terms 'mistaken reliance on theory' strictly, then I agree with Professor Huebner that the ineffectiveness of the field is not to be explained by reference to any such reliance, mistaken or not. Thus, for instance, acceptance of the truth of behaviorism, even when followed with the recommendation that curriculum objectives be specified behaviorally, is not the kind of factor which explains why those who do the actual curriculum building see little value in asking professors of Curriculum how best to determine and to justify the content of curricula. Rather it is the failure of the professoriat to relate the abstract principles, concepts, rules and generalizations (of some normative theory of education) to particular cases of curriculum development--in other words, the absence of effective practical deliberation--which is the key element in the explanation of the uselessness of Curriculum "theorizing". If the Curriculum theorist does no more than discuss and analyze concepts and abstract principles, yet expects the practitioner to use such work as the basis for curriculum building, then the charge of "mistaken reliance on theory" is indeed appropriate. But here the interpretation of that phrase has to be rather loose: 'theory' means simply 'abstractions' and 'mistaken reliance' expresses the fact that a developer should not be expected to rely upon or to directly use abstractions or principles which have not been explicated, broken down, or somehow juxtaposed with particular curriculum prescriptions.

Now I take it that up to this point Professor Huebner and I are still in agreement. My disagreement is with the rest of his diagnosis and with his recommendations, as I understand them.

Professor Huebner suggests that the energies which have been spent on what he takes to be non-essential issues for the field of Curriculum could have been profitably redirected towards, or focused on, the articulation of content alternatives and the modes of presentation of content. I agree with him here only to the extent that there are writers who have attempted to make scholarly contributions to fields like ethics, political theory, and the psychology of learning, while mislabeling their work as Curriculum work. I have not tried to survey the literature, but my guess is that there has been very little work published in Curriculum which belongs squarely in philosophy, psychology, political science, or even in some well-defined specialized area of education.

What we have had a great deal of in Curriculum is work which attempts to apply to the educational domain some of the key concepts and principles of other fields. True, the bulk of such attempts have to be considered failures in the sense that the normative principles or factual generalizations from other fields were not interpreted down to that level of practice where the curriculum developer operates. But in my view such failures do not give us sufficient reason for concluding that the issues in which such admittedly incomplete or ineffective practical deliberation consists should be classified as non-central and transfered out of the field. It is here then that my disagreement with Professor Huebner begins. Let me sketch out the rest of my argument.

Practical deliberation is a skill at which some are better than others. Though it is a skill which can be learned and can be taught, it cannot be encapsulated in some set of simple procedures which when followed will produce the correct answer every time. (In our case--the set of correct curriculum prescriptions.) Nevertheless, some kind of practical deliberation occurs whenever there is curriculum development, but nearly all such deliberation could be vastly improved. The reason why curriculum makers in the schools aren't very good at practical deliberation is because their role (as teachers or curriculum "coordinators") does not provide time and opportunities to practice the application of abstract principles. The reason why writers in the field of Curriculum aren't very effective in completing a series of deliberations down to the level of specific curriculum prescriptions is because their (usually professorial) role does not provide them with the opportunities and incentives for doing so. I consider the fundamental problem to be political or organizational, not a matter of conceptual hyperextension or dilution, as Professor Huebner seems to suggest! I think that if professors of Curriculum could have regular, institutionalized and meaningful political access to curriculum development, then they would soon find ways to anchor down to practice the abstracts elements in practical deliberation with which they have been dealing all along.

I do not believe that the recommended radical conceptual surgery--the restriction of the proper concerns of Curriculum to content and modes of presentation--will enable us to avoid confronting the issues the pursuit of which Huebner thinks has diluted the field and thwarted its autonomy. Before explaining why I don't believe this, I want to touch on a basic conceptual issue.

Professor Huebner seems to adopt the position that one way to reduce the number of different kinds of issues treated in the field of Curriculum is to slice away at the concept of curriculum since the latter is vague and too general. (Instead of stipulating a narrow definition for the concept of curriculum, Huebner opts for dropping it in favor of the concept of course of study which he takes

to be equivalent to the concept of content.) But this position tacitly presupposes that the boundaries of the concept which names the field of study should also serve to circumscribe the inquiry limits of that field. I think such a presupposition is false--shifting from the concept of curriculum to the concept of content would still leave us with the complexities of providing good reasons for this or that content alternative. Unless we engage in such deliberation we would be failing to provide the practitioner with an aware and responsibly developed technical resource.*

Finally, I think there is evidence in Huebner's paper that in the pursuit of what he takes to be the core work of Curriculum, he is unable to keep out some of the issues which he would like to reapportion to other fields. For instance, near the end of his paper Huebner talks about "method being grounded in the intersubjective relationship between educatee and educator" and that we may be required to produce "technologies grounded in the characteristics of the student." Yet earlier in the paper such interests or issues as the nature of educational relationships and human development were listed as candidates for relocation outside the field. Even more surprising is Huebner's concession that "discourses about content should indeed be framed with the care that policy debate requires . . ." But if the rebirth of the Curriculum field requires the transfer of policy issues to other fields, how then are we to produce the "discourses about content" with the requisite care?

Let me conclude with a consideration of a brief methodological remark which Huebner makes near the beginning of his paper. He says that he would not find support for the distinction between theoretical and practical discourse in the positions of the Continental phenomenologists--views with which he presumably is largely sympathetic. This is not the place to discuss phenomenology, but I should point out that if the notion of practical deliberation cannot be part of the conceptual inventory of phenomenology, then there has to be some other way of arriving at justified (or, should I say, "essential") curriculum content. If I understand phenomenologists, they have a rather uncommon answer to this problem. The phenomenological method, which involves a special kind of "intuiting" or "seeing", can be used to discover "essences"--and in our case this would include curriculum content "essences". If Professor Huebner believes that there is such a method and that it can work in Curriculum, then it is no longer surprising that he recommends detaching the normative, theoretical and deliberative superstructure from the field of Curriculum.

---

*I am not suggesting that we preempt the developers' practical deliberations but only that we ourselves cannot avoid deliberation. It would perhaps make things simpler and easier if others could do applied ethics or political science for us. But I think the very nature of practical deliberation precludes such specialization.

Edmund C. Short:

Our second commenter is Bunnie Smith.

B. O. Smith:

At this late hour I don't feel I can do justice to the paper. I don't know whether I agree or disagree with Dwayne's paper because I don't understand the context in which it's developed to begin with. If he is talking about curriculum as a field of research, I could go a long way with him. If he is talking about curriculum as development then I might have much more reservation. I don't know in which direction he is moving or if he's doing both. If he's circumscribing the domain of curriculum research, I think he would find a great deal of support for what he's saying. I'm not going to criticize the paper. I'm going to talk about what he evoked in my thought as I read the paper, and some of the comments I make will be relevant to what he said and some may not be.

This is the age of the great retrenchment. We are told that our national commitments are overextended, that the influence of the government on our lives should be reduced, that the great corporations have too much power and should be broken up, that the influence of the media is too much with us and should somehow be neutralized, that the schools have undertaken too much and that their claims should no longer exceed their means, that the state should no longer require school attendance beyond the age of fourteen, and that the program of instruction should be reduced to the tools of learning at least in the elementary years. Professor Huebner's thesis fits this spirit of retrenchment; it tells us that the curriculum movement of the last hundred years has gradually taken on more than it can carry and has fallen by its own weight.

I further understand that his thesis calls for us to return to a concern with content and the problem of bringing the content into relationship to

the child in accordance with the requirements of modern technology and current conceptions of knowledge and human development. This means that we must strip off the concerns that so many extrinsic interests have brought into the curriculum movement. It would no longer be the business of curriculum specialists to find ways of inducing curriculum change or to educate the teacher for such change. These are matters that belong to those who are concerned with school administration and management. Likewise, evaluation, ideological considerations, and pedagogical method should be relocated in other domains. We come down, then, to the proposition that the course of study is the primary, if not the sole, concern of those who are interested in curriculum as a field of study. I do not know what Professor Huebner means by "course of study." Does it include objectives, content, and organization of content? If so, that is what the Twenty-Sixth Yearbook defined as curriculum.

Professor Huebner has chosen to develop his thesis in the context of history. We desperately need a history of the curriculum movement, an analytic and not a mere descriptive history. There is much advantage in this approach--it enables us to assess our present status objectively; it simplifies our situation by facing us with the roots from which our concerns grew; and it gives us a new perspective for going on from where we are. I think that his analysis of what has happened to the curriculum movement is essentially correct. And I do not disagree with his dissatisfaction with the claim that theoretical preoccupation has killed the movement. Not many ever dealt with theory anyhow!

Nevertheless, I have an uneasiness stemming from the fear that the history of the curriculum movement may itself become a preoccupation, emphasizing the broad context into which we have drifted and neglecting the persistent themes that have dominated courses of study.

The possibility of mere history can be obviated by giving attention to the persistent themes themselves. Let me mention two or three to illustrate what I mean. Almost from the beginning of formal education, the more perceptive teachers have been concerned with the problem of sequencing the content. One can find implicit concerns with this problem in almost every prominent educator from Plato to the present. Comenius emphasized the importance of beginning with the concrete and simple and moving to the more abstract and complex. Their concern is found again in the recapitulation theory of G. Stanley Hall, and in Dewey's notion of the psychological and the logical. It is implicit in Piaget's studies of cognitive development, and in Kohlberg's stages of moral development.

Again, consider the utility of content. This theme has run all the way through educational history. I suspect that the question of utility has been answered typically in terms of what is profitable to the dominant social group. But in recent decades, "utility" has taken on a much broader meaning. It is now possible to consider it not only from the standpoint of what is to the advantage of the individual, but also to the society, taken distributively as well as an entity. Vocational content is typically thought of as advantageous to the individual, but it is also beneficial to the society. Distributively because it can raise the gross national product from which everyone benefits; as an entity because it strengthens the society relatively to other societies. There are many basic questions here. We talk about citizenship, family membership, and so on. Does content make any difference in these? My own hunch is that it does not. Do we as a profession want to determine the use of what we teach? Suppose we could do just that; what kind of power would this give us? I think we'd not want it.

Still again, attention has been given to kinds of content almost from the beginning of schooling. We are accustomed to thinking of content in terms of its relationship to the various aspects of our world. Thus, we

think of the physical sciences, biological sciences, and so on. The content also has another dimension. It can be divided into types such as concepts, laws, law-like statements, rules, and so on. These types are not distributed evenly over what we call the subjects. Mathematics, for instance, contains no empirical laws; neither does history, although we bootleg such laws into history courses when they are nothing more than law-like propositions. These forms of knowledge function differently in our behavior; we can do different things with them. Harry Broudy has called our attention to some of these things we can do with these knowledge forms. I would hope that as we build up the history of the curriculum movement that these sorts of themes will not be neglected.

In general, I concur with Professor Huebner's emphasis upon cleaning house. As Woodrow Wilson said about the university when he was president at Princeton: "The sideshows have run away with the main circus." Perhaps a better analogy would be that we have had too many acts going on under the main tent so that we lost sight of the feature performance. I agree that it is time to move some of the acts out and to get on with the main show.

But before we do this, we had better be clear about the main show. To me, one aspect of it is the study of content in all its dimensions: its classification; its forms; its utility; its relation to experience, and to ways of teaching and learning.

Students learn what they study, and I suspect that John Carroll is correct when he says that the amount of learning is dependent on the amount of time spent in studying. If these two hunches are correct, I suspect that future curriculum thinking will look more to the exploration of content in all its dimensions and to time spent rather than time allocated. Curriculum research will likely give less time to the old belief that organization of

the curriculum--subjects versus core; child-centered versus subject-centered; and the like--determines what is learned. I can only wish that Professor Huebner had given us the benefit of his rich experience and knowledge on the question of content itself and less on the need to clean house. But I have no right to fault him for what he did not do. His analysis surely gives us a new perspective on where we are and have been. For this I feel much indebted to him, and so should we all.

Edmund C. Short:

If there are those who would like to have a conversation about some of the things that have been said or with our respondents, will you please see them here up front. Thank you for attending.

Appendix A

HOW THE DIVISION OF CURRICULUM AND OBJECTIVES STARTED

John R. Mayor

In 1951 when I became the elected chairman of the Department of Education of the University of Wisconsin with much more experience and training in mathematics than in education, I asked the then Dean of the School of Education, John Guy Fowlkes, to recommend several professional educational organizations to which I should belong and which I should support. Without hesitation, he recommended the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development and the National Association of Secondary School Principals. Since 1951 I have been a dues paying member of these organizations but not a particularly active member.

As I recall I also asked about the American Educational Research Association, the title of which appealed to me, but found no enthusiasm on the part of Dean Fowlkes who was then an active educational researcher and a promoter of educational research at the University. Not long after that my responsibilities brought me to Washington where for 18 years I served as a member of the staff with education responsibilities for a scientific society. During those 18 years I had the opportunity to watch quite closely the program and work of both scientific and educational organizations. It seems to me that none of these organizations has made the significant progress in the past 20 years that is the record of the American Educational Research Association. This reflects growth in membership but much more importantly it reflects the services and the nature of the AERA programs.

I personally believe that one of the strengths of AERA has come from the Division organization, and I am glad that I had a small part in the development of the Division organization more than a decade ago. This paper has been prepared at the request of Professor Edmund Short, Pennsylvania

State University.

According to my files, proposals for the establishment of the Divisions of AERA were discussed at the February and October meetings of the Executive Committee in 1961. Then proposals for amendments to the Bylaws which permitted the establishment of the Divisions were outlined at the Executive Committee meeting and were presented at the annual business meeting in February, 1962. Then in May, 1962 the active members voted better than 10 to 1, namely 772-70, to amend the Bylaws in this manner. In 1963 plans were outlined at the Executive Committee meeting and presented at the annual business meeting in February for appointing a Divisional Planning Committee. Plans were outlined at the September meeting of the Executive Committee for establishing five major Divisions and subsequently other Divisions and for obtaining from active members their expressions of interest in one or more of the five major Divisions.

This paper will review briefly the activities in establishing the Division of Curriculum and Objectives. I believe this historical record is worth repeating especially because it demonstrates so well how a professional organization in a somewhat fumbling manner attempts to be efficient in planning organization and administration and at the same time being entirely democratic. I have no criticism of these fumbling methods because in my opinion they represent substantial and important progress.

The Division Planning Committee, according to my records, was appointed by N. L. Gage on March 19, 1963 as authorized by the AERA Executive Committee in the preceding February. Each of the five members was to be chairman of a Divisional Organizational Committee as follows: C. W. Harris, Chairman, Measurement and Research; David G. Ryans, Learning and Instruction; Daniel E. Griffiths, Administration; John R. Mayor, Curriculum and Objectives;

David D. Tiedeman, Student Development and Personnel Services. In March 1963, in my letter of acceptance I named four persons who might serve on the organizing committee for Curriculum and Objectives. These persons were Myron Atkin, Vernon Anderson, Robert Gagné and Willard Jacobson. In a letter of July 16, 1963 from Gage, Anderson and Gagné were appointed. At that time, Anderson was Dean of Education, University of Maryland; Gagné was Director of Research, American Institute for Research, Pittsburgh; and I was Director of Education at AAAS. Gage's letter also suggested plans for organization of the Divisions, definition of purposes of the Divisions, scope and procedures.

A somewhat earlier communication from Harris to the Divisional Planning Committee members and others expressed concern about the number of Divisions which might be formed in AERA and how much machinery should be set up for defining the basis for approval or disapproval of Division petitions. This is illustrative of the early concerns of the Divisional organization which turned out eventually to be fairly easily resolved. A letter from Cronbach expressed concern about the desirability of Division participation in program planning, and how this could best be arranged. Other questions raised were the machinery for getting the Divisions started, whether there would be a standard set of rules for all Divisions, what changes were necessary in the AERA Bylaws. Also perhaps of greatest concern was how officers should be elected for the Division. Under date of September 11, 1963, Griffith sent to members of the Divisional Planning Committee and to chairmen of the Divisional organizing committees, a statement of policy for the Division of Administration. This statement certainly became the model for the statement policy for the Division of Curriculum and Objectives, and I believe for the other Divisions as well. Based on the Griffith model a statement of purposes of the Division of Curriculum and Objectives was

mailed on October 18, 1963 to Harris as Chairman of the Divisional Planning Committee.* On October 31, 1963 a letter from Tiedeman, Chairman of the Organizing Committee for Student Development and Personnel Services to Harris contained a number of excellent suggestions, many of which were now in effect. Some of these were:

I. Getting Divisions started.

Have first meeting as soon as officers exist.

II. Operating rules.

A. Have officers appoint an elections committee which is responsible for nomination and certification of election.

B. Have balloting handled through Washington office.

C. Divisions will have to get into financial game. Special assessments should be permitted. A budget should be required.

D. Divisions may establish their own criteria for membership but one who is not a member of AERA may be a member of a Division. Divisions should be encouraged to keep requirements minimal so that interest may operate as the main criterion of membership. The use of membership for the certification of competence is not to be encouraged.

---

*The Division of Curriculum and Objectives is devoted to the promotion of research in curriculum and objectives. The purposes of the Division are to be accomplished through presenting research reports at annual meetings; facilitating the publication of research studies; identifying and encouraging young research workers; stimulating interdisciplinary approach to research in curriculum; cooperating with other groups and organizations active in and concerned with research in curriculum; fostering the interpretation of research in curriculum and objectives for school practice; and increasing public understanding and appreciation of the importance and promise of curriculum research in the improvement of education.

The Division is to be comprised of active members of the American Educational Research Association who are concerned with research in curriculum and objectives.

III. Changes in by-laws

A. I don't worry about how many Divisions there will be. Limitation will come in the competition for time in the program. As long as the Association rides herd on time, Divisions will be of manageable proportions.

B. I think that membership processing should be primarily done by and for the Association. Associational loyalty should be kept together as interests divide the members. However, if there is a common test as now, and if divisional membership is primarily on the basis of interest, I think that the Association can remain of good health and people can be a little united on the basis of interest.

In November and December 1963 there was considerable exchange of correspondence trying to decide how to get the Divisions started in 1964 and at what time the officers might be elected and whether these officers could be elected at the February, 1964 meeting of AERA or whether the election would have to be delayed so that those interested in the Divisions would have the time to petition for establishment of Divisions and to make some of the decisions including nominations for officers. There was also at this time a considerable debate in the correspondence on requirements for membership in the Divisions. Ryan proposed that the ballot for election of officers of the Division be mailed following the February (1964) meeting. That turned out to be the way that it was done. At one point Gerberich suggested that two members, not the chairman of the organizing committee, serve as nominating committee for the Division but this was ruled out later in favor of nominations coming from the membership. In a letter of January 16, 1964 Gage listed actions and decisions for the Executive Committee regarding the organization of the Division. The correspondence which

has been briefly reviewed in this paper shows that these decisions are based on discussions and correspondence with input from many members of the organization. The actions called for by Gage were:

1) that the chairman of each organizing committee have 30 signatures on a petition for the establishment of the Division by February 1;

2) that at this time there be no consideration (of Divisions) other than the original five and that the procedure for the nomination of officers be established at the February 1964 meeting of AERA;

3) that the vice-president for each Division of over 200 members serve on the Executive Committee of AERA;

4) that there be a one-hour meeting for each Division at the February meeting of AERA in Chicago.

The open meeting for the Division of Curriculum and Objectives was held at 8 A.M. on Friday of the regular AERA meeting in the Lincoln Room. The chairman of each organizing committee was invited to chair these open meetings.

At the February 1964 AERA meeting of the Executive Committee and the Board the election procedure was set up. Nominations were solicited from the membership of the Divisions and sent by Gerberich to the Chairman of the Divisional Committee for tabulation. Gerberich sent to me on April 10, 1964 216 nomination ballots. He announced that April 28 was the cut-off date. Additional slips were obtained later so that the number of ballots submitted for the Curriculum and Objectives Division was 415. These slips nominated 53 different individuals for vice-president of the Division and 32 for secretary.

The organizing committee chairman was asked to send to Gerberich promptly the names of all nominees who received at least three nominations.

For the Division of Curriculum and Objectives these included seven persons: Robert L. Baker, Arno Bellack, B. Bloom, Robert Gagné, Mauritz Johnson Jr., John Goodlad, David Krathwohl. Among these Gagné and Johnson were nominated by six, the others by three. The nominations for secretary included only two persons out of 32 who were nominated by two people. The other 30 were named in a single nomination ballot. The two individuals receiving two votes for secretary were George Jacobs and Galen Saylor. This information with the total list of nominees was then submitted to Gerberich.

My correspondence file on establishment of the Division has no further information. My conclusion, without records to confirm it, is that after the officers had been nominated and elected in the mail ballot of the AERA office the Division organizing committees were discharged, and the new officers took hold.

It was a very distinct pleasure and honor for me to have this part in the organization of the Division of Curriculum and Objectives. I feel among my professional contributions this was one of the more important. It was a privilege to work and correspond with leaders in educatinal research at that time such as Gage, Cronbach, Chester Harris, Gagné and Vernon Anderson. This in itself was adequate compensation for all that I might have done. And is it not from associations like this that the principal benefits of a professional society are derived?

Prepared by request
John R. Mayor
Division of Human & Community Resources
University of Maryland
January 29, 1976